

YAUNĀ AND SAKĀ: IDENTITY CONSTRUCTIONS AT THE MARGINS OF THE ACHAEMENID EMPIRE

Silvia Balatti

Christian-Albrechts University of Kiel

The Achaemenid Empire can be reasonably considered an “empire of peoples” from both an ideological and structural perspective. It included all the lands of the peoples of the world and all people helped to maintain imperial order and prosperity. In reality, the empire had boundaries and there were peoples who lived near and beyond them. Under King Darius I, groups of people were annexed at the northeastern and northwestern margins of the imperial territory, thus entering the imperial space and consequently also the Achaemenid documents. The border peoples of the Yaunā and Sakā were the only peoples of the empire to be differentiated through epithets, which were added to their collective names in the texts. This shows a unique process of group identity constructions by the authorities on the edges of the imperial space. The analysis of the system of epithets used to indicate the Yaunā and Sakā conducted in this paper allows us to draw some conclusions on the mechanisms and reasons behind these specific forms of identity constructions at the margins. Moreover, it shows how this process reflected the main directions of imperial expansion under the first Achaemenids.

INTRODUCTION

Pluralism is a constitutional feature of empires. Every empire benefits from the diversity of its constituent elements, which all concur, to a different extent depending on the case, to create the imperial standard, be it cultural, religious, linguistic, or artistic. There is no doubt, however, that some empires manifestly favor pluralism and diversity more than others. The Achaemenid Empire (550–330 BCE) is probably one of the best examples of a pluralistic empire in the history of the ancient Near East, at least as far as we can infer from the sources available to us (Gates-Foster 2014). The peoples that constituted the Achaemenid Empire are mentioned in the royal inscriptions and administrative texts from Persepolis and are represented on the royal reliefs, thus constituting a frequent motif of royal pride. Emblematic of a royal communication strategy that enhances pluralism are the bas-reliefs on the royal tombs of Naqš-e Rostam and Persepolis. They show a highly standardized scene in which representatives of all the peoples of the empire support the throne of the Persian King. Each representative dresses in what is considered the typical costume of his people (Calmeyer 1982; 1983). Instead of depicting these subdued peoples as crushed by the imperial army or lying at the king’s feet, as in many other well-known examples

of ancient Near Eastern iconography, including the relief of Bīsutūn, the Achaemenid reliefs post-Bīsutūn represent the imperial peoples as constituent parts of the empire. The same idea is expressed by the iconographies on the eastern and northern reliefs of the Apadana, where the representatives of the peoples of the empire are depicted as bearing “gifts” to the king (Schmidt 1953; Root 1979). These well-known images powerfully represent the ideology of the empire of the Achaemenids in their imperial capitals and suggests in which direction the imperial policy toward the subdued peoples could go or at least pretended to go.¹ The peoples of the empire had to provide resources of their lands, in the form of tribute and gifts; their manpower, in the form of workers and soldiers; and their knowledge, in the form of specialists to the Great King. On the other hand, they were allowed self-management as long as they accepted the authority of the Great King. The regular payment of tribute, the delivery of military contingents, and the entertainment of the king and his retinue demonstrated their respect for this greater authority and functioned as a display of the loyalty of the empire’s peoples to their king (Wiesehöfer 1996: 38–41). The complex network of communication inside the Empire and the presence of representatives of the crown on a more local level enabled from a practical perspective contacts, administration, military control and the extraction of taxes (Briant 2002: 391–399).

The integrative policy of the Achaemenids is confirmed by the material evidence. The artistic production in the regions under Achaemenid rule is characterized by its strong locality and continuity with previous tradition, but it also remains in constant dialogue with the official imperial art (Colburn 2014). The iconography of the Egyptian high-ranking courtier Udjahorresnet, who is represented in the typical Egyptian style but characterized by markers of Persian court identity, is exemplary in this regard (Colburn 2020). These few examples clearly indicate that the Achaemenid Empire was from an ideological, political, and also artistic and cultural perspective an empire of peoples.

It is interesting to note that the satrapy as a purely territorial unit is hardly visible in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions. The Old Persian word *dahyu-*, generally translated as “land” or “district” (Kent 1953: 119, 190–191; Schmitt 1999 among many others) or more rarely as “people” (Cameron 1973; Lecoq 1990) seems to have had simultaneously a social and territorial meaning in Persian context (Rossi 1984: 47, 49). This ambiguity, clearly visible in the use of the word in the Old Persian texts (Sancisi Weerdenburg 2001a: 331), is also confirmed by the Babylonian and Achaemenid Elamite rendering of the term respectively as “country” (KUR) and “people” (*dayāuš*; see Aliyari Babolghani 2013 with discussion). A more explicative translation of *dahyu*, which includes both its social and territorial meaning, could instead be “the land where a certain people live” (or in Lecoq’s words: “*pays, lieu occupé par un peuple*,” Lecoq 1997: 137). We can imagine that, for example, Pārsa, the core region of the Achaemenid Empire in the mountains of Southwestern Iran, was essentially conceived as the land where the Pārsa/Persians lived. The neighboring Māda/Medes, although perceived as particularly close to the Persians,² were regardless considered as a different people, a situation that continued for the other peoples of the Empire. Thus, it seems that the Persians constructed socio-cultural identi-

1 This policy, although probably culturally integrative, did not imply that the imperial authority did not resort to violence when needed. Recent studies have showed that the *pax Achaemenica* was basically an ideological construct and that military campaigns, punishments, and executions were very important for the consolidation and maintenance of the Achaemenid Empire (see Jacobs 2009; Tuplin 2017).

2 On the privileged position of the Medes among the other peoples of the empire under Darius and his predecessors; see Balatti 2017: 168–172; 2021.

ties for both themselves and the conquered peoples and based their larger world view around such group identities. The frequent use of ethnic labeling in the administrative documents from Persepolis demonstrates that the fact of belonging to a specific people also served some socio-administrative and legal purposes (Henkelman & Stolper 2009; Rollinger & Henkelman 2009).

In accordance with ancient Near Eastern tradition, the Achaemenid Empire was ideologically universal. In this regard, the titles of “King on this (wide/on the entire) earth” (Schmitt 2014: 154–155) and “King of the lands with all/many peoples” (Schmitt 2014: 229), that were attributed to Darius and Xerxes in their respective inscriptions should be noted. In the identical metal tablets from Hamadan (DHa) and Persepolis (DPh), Darius more precisely states that he possess a kingdom that extended “from the Sakā that (are) beyond Sugdam to Kūš, from Hinduš to Sparda” (DHa § 2, D-H; DPh § 2, D-H).³ This text, which is among the first Achaemenid inscriptions available to us (Mousavi 2012: 43–44), seems to suggest that the peoples and the lands of these peoples played a major role in Darius’ definition of the extent of his imperial space. This is a different set of ideas in comparison to that of the ancient Near Eastern tradition, in which natural barriers such as mountains, seas, and deserts had been essential elements used to define both the world and the extent of the imperial territorial power in Mesopotamia for millennia and were extended to reach “the middle of the sea” and “the middle of the mountains” only in the Neo-Assyrian period (Tadmor 1999; Rollinger 2008; 2010). Interestingly, the Mesopotamian worldview is also evoked by Cyrus in the Cyrus Cylinder from Babylon and by Darius himself in an inscription in Babylonian from the southern wall of the terrace of Persepolis (DPg), where the sovereigns claimed to reach with their kingdom the borders of the world, principally defined by the seas.⁴ This clearly shows that older worldviews continued to persist in the Achaemenid imperial ideology, where they were understandably used primarily in addressing a Mesopotamian audience. New conceptions of the imperial space and old mental maps, but also some geopolitical realities can be found merged together in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions.

It is exactly at the margins of the universal imperial space, the places where the Persian control over the lands of “all” the peoples of the world *de facto* ended, that we can observe the interesting phenomena of identity construction connected to Persian expansion.

THE PEOPLES AT THE MARGINS: YAṂNĀ AND SAKĀ

Although some kind of historical consciousness can be observed in the royal inscriptions of the Teispids and Achaemenids (Rollinger 2014), there is little evidence of military campaigns and historical events in the texts available to us (Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1999). The Achaemenid ideology of universal domination does not contemplate facts related to peoples who were not subject to the imperial power (Rollinger 2017: 214). Thus, if we base our analysis exclusively on

3 In this paper, we principally refer to the texts of the inscriptions in their Old Persian version (see Kent 1953: 116–157; Schmitt 1991; 2000; 2009; Schweiger 1998). The texts are quoted according to Schmitt 2009. For the Elamite versions of the royal inscriptions, we refer to Weissbach 1911; Scheil 1929; Vallat 1977; for the Babylonian, we refer to Weissbach 1911; Scheil 1929; Herzfeld 1938; Steve 1974; Von Voigtlander 1978.

4 Cyrus describes the extent of his world domination as follows: “[On his (Marduk’s)] exalted [orders], all the kings who sit on thrones in the entire world, from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea... they all brought me their heavy tribute” (K2 I, 29). Darius describes the territorial extent of his world empire as follows: “Persia, Media, and the other lands with other tongues, of the mountains and the plains, of this side of the sea [literally ‘Bitter River’] and the far side of the sea, and of this side of the desert [literally ‘Land of Thirst’] and the far side of the desert” (DPg, 7-13).

the Achaemenid documents, we hardly know what was beyond the imperial borders. Nevertheless, a careful analysis of the textual evidence shows that epithets were often added to the names of two particular peoples in the inscriptions of Darius and his son Xerxes: Yaṣnā and Sakā.⁵ Thanks to the combination of internal references and the testimony of the Greek authors, scholars have located the lands of the Yaṣnā and the Sakā at the northwestern and northern margins, respectively, of the Achaemenid Empire (Schmitt 2014: 242–243, 292–293). It follows that specific identification strategies were used in the texts only to indicate two peoples who inhabited the extreme edges of the empire.

The aim of this paper is essentially to investigate the mechanisms and reasons underlying these “unusual” identifications as applied to Yaṣnā and Sakā. In order to do that, we mainly focus our attention on the epithet system used in the Achaemenid Royal inscriptions, particularly in the so-called *dahyāva*-lists, in order to understand the functioning of this system and show its relevance for an ideological and historic-political analysis.⁶ As has been already demonstrated in scholarship some decades ago, the royal inscriptions are ideologically determined documents (Frye 1984: 110–111). Consequently, there is also scholarly consensus on the fact that the *dahyāva*-lists are not a complete and accurate listing of the lands which were part of the empire, but instead an ideological representation of the extension of the power of the Achaemenids. This does not necessarily mean, however, that these lists cannot reflect historical and political realities and changes, especially if they are favorable to the Achaemenids. This can be proposed in particular for the periods in which a state ideology was being formed, as was the case for the first Achaemenids. The difficulty basically lies in gasping and correctly interpreting these realities in sources with a clearly recognizable “ideological layer.”

The Yaṣnā

In Bīsutūn (DB), the oldest of the royal inscriptions of Darius I, the land Yaṣna is listed among the other lands of the peoples subject to the Persian King. It appears after Sparda, which has been commonly identified with the Greek Lydia in the northwesternmost part of the empire (Schmitt 2014: 245), and the vague “lands by the sea” or literally ‘(those) who are (of) the sea’ (DB § 6, H-I). Linguistic evidence and a comparison with the information in the Greek sources have allowed scholars to identify this Yaṣna as the Greek Ionia and its people as the Ionians who inhabited the coasts of Asia Minor (Kent 1953: 204; Brandstand & Mayrhofer 1964: 156), who we know were subjects of the Persians since Cyrus’ conquest of Lydia (Hdt. 1.141). The sea mentioned in the vague expression “lands by the sea” is likely the Mediterranean, the Upper Sea of the ancient Near Eastern tradition, and the peoples by the sea could be tentatively identified with Eastern Mediterranean sea peoples, such as the Cypriotes and other groups (Zournatzi

5 Toponyms and ethnonyms are notoriously ambivalent in the royal inscriptions, and this also applies to the case of Yaṣnā and Sakā (see Tables 1 and 2). The interchangeable use of the singular (Yaṣna, Saka) and plural forms (Yaṣnā, Sakā) is connected to this ambivalence. In general, it can be noted that in the Old Persian versions of the inscriptions the plural form is more often used to indicate the people while the singular form indicates either a single member of a certain people or the land in which they live. In what follows, the plural and singular forms are maintained as they are reported in the texts.

6 Although several peoples of the empire are mentioned in the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury tablets (Henkelman & Stolper 2009), the other large archives of texts from the core of the Achaemenid Empire, the epithet system is not used in an administrative context.

2018).⁷ Although the identification of Yaṇna as the land occupied by the Ionians/Greeks leaves little doubt from the overall perspective (Sancisi-Weerdenburg 2001a; 2001b), it is also reasonable to assume that the Persians and Greeks had different identification strategies (Rollinger 2020). Thus, what the Persians meant to indicate with “Yaṇnā” would not exactly correspond to what the Greeks identified as Ionians, a concept that also changed locally and over time (Crielaard 2009). Thus, it may well be that the term “Yaṇnā” used in Bīsūtūn included both Greek and some non-Greek speaking populations from the far northwestern coastal Anatolia (Klinkott 2001).

Interestingly, Bīsūtūn is one of the few available Achaemenid inscriptions in which the *dahyu* Yaṇna appear as a unitary entity in the lists, not diversified through the use of epithets. In the other cases wherein Yaṇnā appears without any added epithets, it is generally used to concretely refer to specific work units, rather than to the land and people, and its ideological position in the imperial space.⁸ The Yaṇnā are not mentioned in the foundation tablets from Hamadan and Persepolis DHa/DPh (see above), but do appear in one inscription in Old Persian from the southern wall of the terrace of Persepolis (DPe). This inscription is most likely among the oldest from Persepolis (Filippone 2012: 102; Schmitt 2021). Although it is difficult to provide an absolute date for this text, it can probably be pinned to the end of the sixth century BCE at the latest (Mousavi 2012: 43). Here, the ethnonym, which is written in its plural form Yaṇnā and appears listed after the land Sparda as in the text of Bīsūtūn, is followed by epithets. The text reads as follows:

Sparda, Yaṇnā tayai uškahyā utā tayai drayahyā utā dahyāva taya para draya (DPe § 2, J-L)

Sparda, the Yaṇnā on the mainland (lit. dry land) and (those who dwell) on the sea and the lands beyond the sea.

The Yaṇnā are identified as those who lived in a space that both included land and sea; they are followed in the list by the mention of undefined lands (of peoples) beyond the sea. In a list from Susa (DSe), which is commonly known as the “Restoration of Order in the Empire” (Kent 1953: 110), the Yaṇnā are again mentioned in the context of other northwestern peoples, as follows:

Sparda, Yaṇnā tayai drayahyā, Sakā tayai paradraya, Skudra, Yaṇnā tayai paradraya, Kṛkā (DSe § 4, H-K)

Sparda, the Yaṇnā on the sea, the Sakā beyond the sea, Skudra, the Yaṇnā beyond the sea, the Kṛkā.

7 Schmitt (1972) identifies the “countries by the sea” with the Propontis thanks to a comparison between this expression and the corresponding Greek title of the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia mentioned in the Letters of Themistocles. Although reasonable from a linguistic perspective, this identification is difficult to definitively prove because of different issues that consist of the extremely vague and ideological character of the expression in the inscription, the literary nature of the Letters, and the gap between the early reign of Darius and that of Artaxerxes, who was the recipient of the Letters, not to mention the problem of the later composition of the text, which must be dated around 100 CE, and its relation with the primary sources (Rosenmeyer 2006: 49).

8 Yaṇnā as a unitary group of workers is mentioned in the construction inscriptions from Susa DSf (§ 9, F; § 13, C) and DSz (§ 13, C). DSf and DSz (§ 11, D) also refer to color material from Yaṇna. Since these inscriptions refer to the Yaṇnā and their land in another context than the *dahyāva*-lists, they are not listed in Table 1. The use of the term “Yaṇnā” in the construction inscriptions from Susa is probably comparable with that of the administrative texts from Persepolis, where “Yaṇnā” refers to a work unit and is mentioned without epithets.

In this passage, the Yaṇnā seem to have inhabited a maritime region, which possibly included land and sea, and extended in the land beyond the sea. Other peoples who lived in the land beyond the sea are now identified with the ethnonym Sakā and possibly with the land Skudra (see below).⁹ Interestingly, the Elamite, and probably also the Babylonian, version diverges from that in Old Persian and distinguishes the land Yaṇna on the sea (El. ^{AŠ}*iauna akkapè* ^dKAM.MEŠ *marriš*; Bab. ^{KUR}*iamana ša ina* A.A.BA) from the vague Yaṇna-land/s (El. ^{AŠ}*iaunaip*; Bab. ^{KUR}*iamana*). The latter probably occupied an undefined space beyond the sea.

Another small group of significant inscriptions in the context of our investigation are those engraved on the façade of the tomb of Darius I at Naqš-e Rostam. A passage of the longer text (DNa), which is written behind the figure of Darius, reads as follows:

Sparda, Yaṇna, Sakā tayaj paradraya, Skudra, Yaṇnā takabarā (DNa § 3, S-U)

Sparda, Yaṇna, the Sakā beyond the sea, Skudra, the Yaṇnā takabarā

The same designation Yaṇna and Yaṇna takabara (El. *iauna* and *iauna daqabarra*) appears in the short epigraphs (DNe) written above the reliefs, which visually represent the peoples of the empire mentioned in DNa.¹⁰ These are the only inscriptions in which the couple Yaṇna/ā and Yaṇna/ā takabara/ā are substituted for Yaṇnā on the sea and Yaṇnā beyond the sea. It can be reasonably hypothesized that these are two forms used to express the same concept, but that in the case of Yaṇnā and Yaṇnā takabarā the main emphasis was put on their appearance and cultural features rather than on their spatial distribution. In fact, although the correct interpretation of the epithet “*takabara*” is still a matter of debate, scholars do agree that this term indicated a headgear of some sort. According to a reinterpretation by Robert Rollinger (2006), this headgear could represent the round shield the Greek hoplites hold to cover their heads, rather than the *petasos* or *kausia* as previously thought. This would be explicitly suggested by the Babylonian rendering of Yaṇnā takabarā as “the Iamanā who wear a shield on their head” (^m*iamana šanûtu ša maginnāta ina qaqqadī-šunu našû*).

The same binary strategy of identifying the Yaṇnā used in Darius’ inscriptions from Persepolis and Susa is also found in the only *dahyāva*-lists that can be attributed to Darius’ son Xerxes (XPh). Here, the Yaṇnā are again identified with the designations of those who live on the sea and those who live beyond the sea (XPh § 3, Q-R). In this case the three versions (Old Persian, Elamite, and Babylonian) correspond, except for the reference to Yaṇnā as an ethnonym in Old Persian and Babylonian and as a toponym in Elamite.

9 On the Skudra, see Henkelman & Stolper 2009 with references; Wiesehöfer 2009/2011.

10 DNe is extremely fragmentary, but we can integrate it with the very similar inscriptions accompanying the relief of the throne carriers on the tomb V from Persepolis, which must be attributed to King Artaxerxes II or III (A³Pb). In what follows, I will always refer to the text of DNe already integrated with A³Pb.

Table 1 The occurrence of the words for Yaṇnā in the *dahyāva*-lists.

Inscription	Old Persian	Elamite	Babylonian
DB	Yaṇna (Sg.)	^m iaunaip	^{KUR} iamanu
DPe	Yaṇnā tayaṭ uškahyā utā tayaṭ drayahyā	—	—
DSe	Yaṇnā tayaṭ drayahyā... Yaṇnā tayaṭ paradraya	^{AŠ} iauna akkapè ^d KAM.MEŠ marriš... ^{AŠ} iaunaip	^{KUR} iamana ša ina A.A.BA... [^{KUR} iamana]
DNa	Yaṇna (Sg.)... Yaṇnā takabarā	^m iauna ^m iauna daqabarrape	^{KUR} iamanu [^{KUR} ia]manu šanūtu ša maginnāta ina qaqqadī-šunu našū
DNe/A ³ Pb	Yaṇna (Sg.) Yaṇna takabara (Sg.)	^m iauna ^m iauna daqabarra	^{LÚ} iamanā (Pl.) ^{LÚ} iamanā (Pl.) šanūtu ša maginnāta ina qaqqadī-šunu našū
XPh	Yaṇnā tayaṭ drayahyā dārayanti... Yaṇnā tayaṭ paradraya dārayanti	^{AŠ} iauna akkapè ^d KAM.MEŠ marriš kuttā akkapè ^d KAM.MEŠ lakka marrištā	^m iamana ša ina ^{1D} marrat ašbū u ša aḫullū ša ^{1D} marrat ašbu

The Sakā

In the Bīsūtūn inscription, the land Saka (or the people of the same name in the Elamite version) is mentioned among the eastern lands in the list found in the initial part of the inscription (DB § 6, K). Saka is also indicated as one of the lands that rebelled against Darius after his accession to the throne, although no rebel king is mentioned in the text as was the case for the other lands (DB § 21, A-G). Finally, the last part of the inscription, which was added later and only in the Old Persian version of the text (Huysse 1999), deals with Darius' campaign against the Sakā in his first years of reign. It reads as follows:

θāti Dārayava.uš xšāyaθiya: pasāva hadā kārā adam ašiyavam abi Sakām, pasāva Sakā, tayaṭ xaūdām tigrām baranti, imaṭ patiš mām ājša, yadi abi draya avārsam; draxtā ava hadā kārā visā viyatarayam; pasāva avaj Sakā adam ajanam, aniyam agrbāya; haṭ basta anayatā abi mām, utāšām haya maθišta āha, - Skunxa nāma - avam agrbāya bastam anaya abi mām; avadā aniyam maθištam akunavam, yaθā mām kāma āha; pasāva dahyāuš manā abava. (DN § 74, A-O)

Proclaims Darius, the king: Afterwards with an army I went against the Sakā; after that the Sakā, who wear the pointed cap, these came against me when I had come down to the sea. By means of a tree-trunk with the all army I crossed it. Afterwards, I defeated those Sakā; another (part of them) they captured, that was led to me in fetters. And (the man) who was their chief, Skunkha by name, him they captured (and) led to me in fetters. There I made another (their) chief, as was my desire. After that the country became mine.

A representative of those Sakā who wore pointed caps was also added to the relief of Bīsūtūn, probably around 518 BCE. A short inscription above the head of this representative reads “This is Skunkha, the Saka” (DBk § 1, A-B). This early campaign outside the borders of the Persian Empire likely confronted the Great King with the fact that different groups of Sakā lived at the margins of his empire, beyond the sea at the very end of the world of Mesopotamian tradition (Rollinger 2014; Rollinger & Degen 2021). These Sakā now needed to be clearly identified so as to be included in the Achaemenid universe. As was the case for the representatives of the other peoples of the empire represented on the Achaemenid reliefs, also the new annexed Sakā were identified by their clothing, in this case especially by their pointed caps.

The foundation inscriptions from Hamadan and Persepolis DHa/DPh and DPe again mention the Sakā; in the first two identical texts they are located beyond Sugdam (Bab. “beyond the

Sogdians”) while on the other they appear in the list after Gandhara (DPe § 2, Q). All these references seem to clearly indicate Sakā who lived at the northeastern margins of the empire (Szemerényi 1980: 10–11; Dandamaev 1989: 138). It is difficult to establish with certainty if they all refer to the Sakā tigraxaḡdā. Three different groups of Sakā are instead listed in Darius’ inscription from Susa (DSe); this highly fragmentary text can be partially completed and reconstructed through the Babylonian version of the same inscription. Rüdiger Schmitt reconstructs the Old Persian epithets of the Sakā of DSe as follows: the Sakā haḡmavargā (who drink haoma) and the Sakā tigraxaḡdā (who wear a pointed cap), who are both listed among the eastern peoples, and the Sakā tayaḡ paradraya (beyond the sea), who appear after the Yaṣnā on the sea and the Skudra (DSe § 4, D-E; J; see above). The natural consequence of this order and positioning would be that the latter Sakā inhabited the northwesternmost margin of the empire (Tuplin 2010: 296), namely, the Black Sea region.¹¹ This is very likely, since there is other evidence confirming it. Greek tradition refers to Darius’ campaign against the Scythians, whose territory was located beyond Thrace and the Danube, on the northwestern shores of the Black Sea (primarily, Hdt. 4.1-142). Pierre Briant (2002: 142) cautiously suggests that this campaign could have taken place around 513 BCE, certainly after Darius’ campaign against the eastern Sakā. Moreover, archaeological evidence confirms the presence of groups that can be culturally associated with the Sakā/Scythians in the areas to the north and northwest of the Black Sea (Parzinger 2007). Exactly the same epithets of DSe are used in the inscriptions DNa and DNe from Naqš-e Rostam to indicate the different groups of Sakā (DNa § 3, O-P; T; A³Pb 14–15; 24). Interestingly, the overseas Sakā, who are never attributed a designation other than “beyond the sea” in the texts, disappear from Xerxes’ inscription, which only mentions the eastern Sakā, namely the haḡmavargā and the tigraxaḡdā (XPh § 3, T-U). Christopher Tuplin (2010: 296, 298) reasonably suggests that a possible explanation for the disappearance of the Sakā beyond the sea from Xerxes’ documents could be a change of policy in the Black Sea region during the reign of Darius’ son. Interestingly, the ethnonym of a third Scythian group of the northeast, the Dahā, firstly appears in XPh (§ 3, T) (Jacobs & Gufler 2021). This could suggest an Achaemenid expansionary policy more oriented towards the Scythians of the trans-Caspian region rather than towards those of the Black Sea under Xerxes.

Persian-Egyptian documents also mention the Sakā.¹² The lists of peoples found on the base of Darius’ statue from Susa, which was originally realized for an Atum-temple in Egypt, and also on the stelae from the Suez Canal, mention and depict the Sakā as one of the twenty-four peoples of the empire. They occupy the twelfth position, after other eastern lands and at the end of the first series of *dahyāva*. The Egyptian cartouche for Sakā is, however, written differently in the two texts (*S-g pḡ sk t3* and *Sk pḡ sk (t3?)*) and the word Sakā seems to appear twice at least in the list on the Suez Canal stelae, where it is written *Sk pḡ sk (t3?)*; Posener translates the multiple cartouche on the stelae as “the Sakā of the marshland” and “the Sakā of the plain” (Posener 1936: 184). This reading remains problematic, however, especially if compared to the cartouche on the statue, where the word translated by Posener as Sakā is written in two different ways. Following the older interpretation by Golénischeff, Melanie Wasmuth alternatively translated the cartouche as “*die Sakā/Skythen vom Ende des Sakenlandes*” (Wasmuth 2017: 175). Although there is still scholarly disagreement on this topic, it is interesting to note

11 Against this hypothesis, see Jacobs 1994: 257–260.

12 It is difficult to date with certainty the documents as well as the completion of the Suez Canal (see Tuplin 1991: 249–250, 255).

that none of the tentative translations presently proposed correspond to the epithets for the Sakā used in the texts from Western Iran.

Table 2 The occurrences of the word for Sakā in the *dahyāva*-lists.

Inscription	Old Persian	Elamite	Babylonian	Egyptian
DB	Saka (Sg.) Saka (Sg.) Sakām ¹³ Sakā tigraxaudā	^m sákkape ^m sákkape	^{KUR} gimiri ^{KUR} gimiri-	—
DBk	Saka (Sg.)	^m sákka	—	—
DPh/DHa	hacā Sakāibiš ¹⁴ tayai para Sugdam	^m sákkape ikkimar akkape ^{AŠ} suigda	^m gimiri ša nibirtum ^m sugda	—
DPe	Sakā	—	—	—
DSe	Sakā haumavargā Sakā tigraxaudā Sakā tayai paradraya	^{AŠ} sákka ^{AŠ} umumarqaip, ^{AŠ} sákka [tigraxaudap] (...) ^{AŠ} sákka akkape ^d KAM.MEŠ miuttumanna	... ^m gimiri ša ina nibirtum ^{ID} marratum ašbū	—
DNa	Sakā haumavargā Sakā tigraxaudā Sakā tayai paradraya	^m sákka ^m umumarqaip, ^m sákka appa tigraxaudap (...) ^m sákka appa ^d KAM.MEŠ miuttumanna	^{KUR} gimiri umurga-, ^{KUR} gimiri š[a ka]rballatišunu (...), [^{KUR} gi]miri ša aḫu ullū ša nari marratum	—
DNe/A ³ Pb	Saka haumavargā (Sg.) Saka tigraxaudā (Sg.) Saka tayai paradraya (Sg.)	^m sákka umumarqaip, ^m sákka tigraxaudap (...) ^m sákka ^d KAM.MEŠ ikka lakka	^m gimiri umurga, ^m gimiri ša karballatišunu zaqpa (...) ^m gimiri ša aḫu ullū ša nari marratum	—
XPh	Sakā haumavargā Sakā tigraxaudā	^{AŠ} sákka umumarqa, ^{AŠ} sákka tigraxauda	^m gimir umurga-, ^m gimir tigraxauda	—
DSeg5a				<i>S-g ph sk t3</i>
DZeg5a				<i>Sk ph sk (t3?)</i>

CONCLUSIONS

This analysis of Darius' and Xerxes's inscriptions referencing different groups of Yaunā and Sakā allow us to draw several conclusions:

1. Two main strategies are used to identify those who are perceived as different groups of the same border peoples in the *dahyāva*-lists: one, citing the location of their land in relation to the sea, and two, reference to a piece of clothing or cultural feature. These strategies of identification probably reflected the different worldviews and conceptions of space that merged together in the Achaemenid royal ideology. The first designation is clearly in dialogue with older Mesopotamian mental maps of the world. In this respect, the use of the expression “beyond the sea” (which is always referred to as “Bitter River” in the Babylonian versions) shows that the sea and in general the natural barriers did not mark the end of the world anymore, as it was the case for the ancient Near Eastern tradition before the Neo-Assyrian period, when Sargon II and his successors “started to cross the sea” (Radner 2010). In Darius' time, the imperial space could extend beyond the sea and even include it, as was the case for the northwestern sea(s) of the Yaunā and Sakā. This is an epochal change from the point of view of Near Eastern

13 The form Sakām is accusative plural.

14 The form Sakāibiš is ablative plural masculine; see Schmitt 2014: 242–243.

imperial ideology (Klinkott 2021). The next step in this ideological construct is the manipulation of the sea (and of the geographical space in general) by the king. This further conception can be detected in Darius' inscription, which commemorates the building of the Red Sea Canal (Haubold 2012: 7). The second designation, which refers to a piece of clothing or cultural feature, is instead in line with the Persian idea of a pluralistic imperial space in which each people maintained their own languages, habits, and customs. Both identification strategies (and related worldviews) are used in the texts, even if there seems to be a tendency of gradual awareness (and imperial appropriation) of the customs of the peoples on the margins and the consequent adoption of the second type of designation. This does not, however, preclude returning to use the first identification strategy when some conditions changed. Xerxes's choice to indicate again the furthest group of Yaṣnā with the vague expression "beyond the sea" could hide the intention to relocate these Yaṣnā in a remote space at far edge of the world after the failure of his campaign against Hellas. On the other hand, the western Sakā, who are never attributed a designation other than "beyond the sea" in Darius' texts and completely disappeared from Xerxes' monuments, had probably never stably entered the imperial space.

The way of identifying the Yaṣnā and the Sakā in the lists of peoples from Egypt presents significant differences from other such references. The Yaṣnā do not appear at all in the Egyptian lists and the Sakā are mentioned with a different epithet than those generally used in the texts from Western Iran. As Melanie Wasmuth (2017: 184) has already noted, these differences should likely be attributed to Egyptian conceptions. In other words, it is probable that the documents from Egypt express an identification strategy, possibly even an older one, which was formulated and understandable in an Egyptian rather than Iranian context. Similarly, the Babylonian versions of the Achaemenid texts often use older Mesopotamian terminology and conceptions, such as, for example, those of the Iamanā (Rollinger 2011) and Gimiri/Cimmerians (Lanfranchi 1990; 2009/2011), and that of the imperial space which extends from the shores of one sea to that of the other sea, to express new Persian meanings. These terms and the concepts related to them could mislead the investigation on the Achaemenid Persian conception of the imperial space if not considered in relation to their cultural background.

2. A growing knowledge of the peoples in the border areas to the northeast and to the northwest of the empire seems to characterize Darius I's inscriptions. More detailed information on the border peoples appears in particular in texts from Susa and Naqš-e Rostam, where the system of epithets is primarily used. Although an absolute chronology of Darius' inscriptions is presently impossible with our current state of knowledge, a relative chronology of the inscriptions can be suggested in some cases. For example, the texts from Susa and Naqš-e Rostam, DSe and DN, must be considered later than the Bīsūtūn inscription and also later than the foundation inscriptions on the southern part of the Persepolis terrace, DHa/DPh and DPe. The growing knowledge and familiarity with border areas and their peoples and the necessity to identify them seen in Darius' later inscriptions most likely goes hand in hand with his military and political involvement in the northeastern and northwestern regions and the consequent enlargement of the imperial space and definition of his imperial ideology. The fact that Darius' expansionism was primarily directed toward the Aegean and Black Sea regions and Central Asia is confirmed by other sources at our disposal. As is well known, Persian military engagements in the Aegean area under Darius and Xerxes and in the Black Sea region under Darius are well attested in the Greek sources, primarily in Herodotus' work. Achaemenid campaigns in the Black Sea area are also confirmed by the recent discovery of a fragment of an Achaemenid

inscription at Phanagoria in Southern Russia (Kuznecov & Nikitin 2018).¹⁵ In addition to the textual sources, the glyptic also seems to provide interesting information on Achaemenid military engagements. Recent studies on the Achaemenid glyptic material have shown that the Yaṣnā and the Central Asians are the most represented peoples in the warfare scenes on the Achaemenid seals (Wu 2014: 247–253). In this regard, Xin Wu (2014: 272) suggests that these warfare scenes may reflect some historical events. In particular, we can hypothesize that the political conflicts in Central Asia under Darius and his successors were probably more numerous than generally thought (Wu 2010).

3. The strategies of identification through epithets are used to indicate those who were perceived as culturally homogeneous peoples, who were found at the borders, and who were perceived to inhabit the empire but also represented an outside world. The Yaṣnā and the Sakā probably needed additional designations because it was still unclear what exactly could be defined—or wanted to be defined—as the land of the Sakā and the land of the Yaṣnā. If from a purely ideological perspective the authority of the Great King already extended to the undefined lands of the Yaṣnā and the Sakā because the king ruled over the entire earth and over the lands (and seas) of all the peoples of the world, it followed that from a political perspective, the presence of such peoples whose lands also extended outside the empire's political borders would have justified—and even required—an expansion in these directions. This process of ideological justification of military engagements against border peoples in the context of the Achaemenid imperial worldview would also explain why exactly the Yaṣnā and the Central Asians are represented as the enemies of the empire *par excellence* in the warfare narrative scenes on the Achaemenid seals mentioned above. Thus, the analysis of the designations of the Yaṣnā and the Sakā in the context of the Achaemenid composite worldview performed in this paper not only provides evidence of Achaemenid expansionism in the border areas of the northwest and northeast but also offers an ideological justification for it.

REFERENCES

- ALIYARI BABOLGHANI, Salman 2013. Achaemenid Elamite *dayāuš* (~ Old Persian *dahyāy-š*). *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 27: 113–128.
- BALATTI, Silvia 2017. *Mountain Peoples in the Ancient Near East: The Case of the Zagros in the First Millennium BCE*. (Classica et Orientalia 18) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BALATTI, Silvia 2021. „Persien und Medien und die anderen Länder“: Einige Überlegungen zur Rolle der Meder im frühen Perserreich. In: H. KLINKOTT, A. LUTHER & J. WIESEHÖFER (eds), *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Iran und benachbarter Gebiete, Festschrift für Rüdiger Schmitt* (Oriens et Occidens 36): 29–47. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- BRANDSTAND Wilhelm & Manfred MAYRHOFER 1964. *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BRIANT, Pierre 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- CALMEYER, Peter 1982. Zur Genese Altiranischer Motive, VIII. Die ‚Statistische Landkarte des Perser-reiches‘, I. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 15: 105–187.
- CALMEYER, Peter 1983. Zur Genese Altiranischer Motive, VIII. Die ‚Statistische Landkarte des Perser-reiches‘, II. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 16: 141–222.
- CAMERON, George G. 1973. The Persian Satrapies and Related Matters. *JNES* 32: 47–56.
- COLBURN, Henry P. 2014. Art of the Achaemenid Empire, and Art in the Achaemenid Empire. In: B.A. BROWN & M.H. FELDMAN (eds), *Critical Approaches to Ancient Near Eastern Art: 773–800*. Boston: De Gruyter.

15 This fragment, which has been tentatively attributed to Darius (Rung & Gabelko 2018; 2019; Shavarebi 2019), does not provide, however, certain information other than its own presence in the area (Schmitt 2019).

- COLBURN, Henry P. 2020. Udjahorresnet the Persian: Being an Essay on the Archaeology of Identity. In: M. WASMUTH & P.P. CREASMAN (eds), *Udjahorresnet and His World* (Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections 26): 59–74. Tucson: Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections.
- CRIELAARD, Jan P. 2009. The Ionians in the Archaic period: Shifting Identities in a Changing World. In: T. DERKS & N. ROYMANS (eds), *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition*: 37–84. Amsterdam: University Press.
- DANDAMAEV, Muhammad A. 1989. *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*. Leiden: Brill.
- FILIPPONE, Ela 2012. DPd/DPe and the Political Discourse of King Darius. In: G.P. BASELLO & A. ROSSI (eds), *Dariosh Studies, II. Persepolis and its Settlements: Territorial System and Ideology in the Achaemenid State*: 101–119. Naples: Il Torcoliere.
- FRYE, Richard N. 1984. *The History of Ancient Iran*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft: Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients 3(7)) Munich: Beck.
- GATES-FOSTER, Jennifer 2014. Achaemenids, Royal Power and Persian Ethnicity. In: J. MCINERNEY (ed.), *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*: 175–191. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- HAUBOLD, Johannes 2012. The Achaemenid Empire and the Sea. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 21(1): 4–23.
- HENKELMAN, Wouter F.M. & Matthew W. STOLPER 2009. *Ethnic Identity and the Ethnic Labelling at Persepolis: The Case of the Skudrians*. In: P. BRIANT & M. CHAUVEAU (eds), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France, 9–10 novembre 2007* (Persika 13): 271–329. Paris: De Boccard.
- HERZFELD, Ernst 1938. *Altpersische Inschriften*. (Ergänzungsband I zu AMI) Berlin: Reimer.
- HUYSE, Philip 1999. Some Further Thoughts on the Bisitun Monument and the Genesis of the Old Persian Cuneiform Script. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series* 13: 45–66.
- JACOBS, Bruno 1994. *Die Satrapienverwaltung im Perserreich zur Zeit Darius' III*. (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients 87) Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- JACOBS, Bruno 2009. Grausame Hinrichtungen – friedliche Bilder: Zum Verhältnis der politischen Realität zu den Darstellungsszenarien der achämenidischen Kunst. In: M. ZIMMERMAN (ed.), *Extreme Formen von Gewalt in Bild und Text des Altertums* (Münchner Studien zur Alten Welt): 121–153. Munich: Utz.
- JACOBS, Bruno & Birgit GUFLER 2021. Nomads of the Steppes. In: B. JACOBS & R. ROLLINGER (eds), *A Companion to the Achaemenid Persian Empire*: 681–694. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- KENT, Roland G. 1953. *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. (American Oriental Series 33) New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- KLINKOTT, Hilmar 2001. Yauna: Griechen in den Perserinschriften. In: H. KLINKOTT (ed.), *Anatolien im Lichte kultureller Wechselwirkungen: Akkulturationsphänomene in Kleinasien und seinen Nachbarregionen während des 2. und 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*: 107–148. Tübingen: Attempto.
- KLINKOTT, Hilmar 2021. Der Grosskönig und das Meer: Achämenidisches Reichsverständnis in einem neuen Weltbild. In: H. KLINKOTT, A. LUTHER & J. WIESEHÖFER (eds), *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Iran und benachbarter Gebiete, Festschrift für Rüdiger Schmitt* (Oriens et Occidens 36): 111–136. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- KUZNECOV, Vladimir D. & Alexander B. NIKITIN 2018. Drevnepersidskaja nadpis' iz Fanagorii. In: A.A. ZAVOIKIN & V.D. KUZNECOV (eds), *Fanagorija. Rezul'taty archeologičeskich issledovanij*, VI: 154–159. Moscow: IARAN.
- LANFRANCHI, Giovanni Battista 1990. *I Cimneri: emergenza delle élites militari iraniche nel Vicino Oriente (VIII – VII sec. a. C.)*. Padova: Sargon.
- LANFRANCHI, Giovanni Battista 2009/2011. Skythen (Scythians), in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 12: 581–583.
- LECOQ, Pierre 1990. Observations sur le sens du mot *dahyu* dans les inscriptions achéménides. *Transeuphratene* 3: 131–139.
- LECOQ, Pierre 1997. *Les inscriptions de la Perse achéménide: trad. du vieux perse, de l'élamite, du babylonien et de l'araméen*. Paris: Gallimard.
- MOUSAVI, Ali 2012. *Persepolis: Discovery and Afterlife of a World Wonder*. Boston: De Gruyter.
- PARZINGER, Hermann 2007. Die Reiternomaden der eurasischen Steppe während der Skythenzeit. In: W. MENGHIN & H. PARZINGER (eds), *Im Zeichen des goldenen Greifen: Königsgräber der Skythen*: 30–48. Munich: Prestel.

- POSENER, Georges 1936. *La première domination perse en Egypte: recueil d'inscriptions hiéroglyphiques*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'institut français de l'archéologie orientale.
- RADNER, Karen 2010. *Stele of Sargon II of Assyria at Kition: A Focus for an Emerging Cypriot Identity?*. In: R. ROLLINGER, B. GUFLER, M. LANG & I. MADREITER (eds), *Interkulturalität in der Alten Welt: Vorderasien, Hellas, Ägypten und die vielfältigen Ebenen des Kontakts* (Philippika 34): 429–449. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2006. *YAUNĀ TAKABARĀ and MAGINNĀTA* tragender ‚Ioner‘: Zum Problem der ‚griechischen‘ Thronträgerfiguren in Naqsch-i Rostam und Persepolis. In: R. ROLLINGER & B. TRUSCHNEGG (eds), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante: Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag* (Oriens et Occidens 12): 365–400. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2008. Das altorientalische Weltbild und der ferne Westen in neuassyrischer Zeit. In: P. MAURITSCH, W. PETERMANDL, R. ROLLINGER & C. ULF (eds), *Antike Lebenswelten. Konstanz – Wandel – Wirkungsmacht: Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 70. Geburtstag* (Philippika 25): 683–695. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2010. Berg und Gebirge aus altorientalischer Perspektive. In: W. KOFLER, M. KORENJAK & F. SCHAFFENRATH (eds), *Gipfel der Zeit: Berge in Texten aus fünf Jahrtausenden: Karlheinz Töchterle zum 60. Geburtstag* (Paradeigmata 12): 11–53. Wien: Rombach.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2011. Der Blick aus dem Osten: ‚Griechen‘ in vorderasiatischen Quellen des 8. und 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. – eine Zusammenschau. In: H. MATTHÄUS, N. OETTINGER & S. SCHRÖDER (eds), *Der Orient und die Anfänge Europas* (Philippika 42): 267–282. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2014. Thinking and Writing about History in Teispid and Achaemenid Persia. In: K. RAAFLAUB (ed.), *Thinking, Recording and Writing History in the Ancient World*: 187–212. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2017. Monarchische Herrschaft am Beispiel des teispidisch-achaimenidischen Großreichs. In: S. REBENICH (ed.), *Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum*: 189–215. Boston: De Gruyter.
- ROLLINGER, Robert 2020. Neo-Assyrian through Persian Empires. In: F. DE ANGELIS (ed.), *A Companion to Greeks Across the Ancient World*: 173–198. Malden: Blackwell.
- ROLLINGER, Robert & Wouter F.M. HENKELMAN 2009. New Observations on “Greeks” in the Achaemenid Empire According to Cuneiform Texts from Babylonia. In: P. BRIANT & M. CHAUVEAU (eds), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France, 9–10 novembre 2007* (Persika 13): 331–351. Paris: De Boccard.
- ROLLINGER, Robert & Julian DEGEN 2021. Conceptualizing Universal Rulership: Considerations on the Persian Achaemenid Worldview and the Saka at the “End of the World.” In: H. KLINKOTT, A. LUTHER & J. WIESEHÖFER (eds), *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Iran und benachbarter Gebiete, Festschrift für Rüdiger Schmitt* (Oriens et Occidens 36): 187–224. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- ROOT, Margaret 1979. *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*. (Acta Iranica 9) Leiden: Brill.
- ROSENMEYER Patricia A. 2006. *Ancient Greek Literary Letters*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- ROSSI, Adriano V. 1984. Glottonimia ed etnonimia nell'Iran achemenide. *AIQN* 6: 39–65.
- RUNG, Eduard V. & Oleg L. GABELKO 2018. Skifskij pohod Darija I i drevnepersidskaja nadpis' iz Fanagorii. *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 78(4): 847–869.
- RUNG, Eduard V. & Oleg L. GABELKO 2019. From Bosphorus ... to Bosphorus: An New Interpretation and Historical Context of the Old Persian Inscription from Phanagoria. *Iranica Antiqua* 54: 83–125.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG, Heleen 1999. The Persian Kings and History. In: C. SHUTTLEWORTH KRAUS (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*: 91–112. Leiden: Brill.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG, Heleen 2001a. Yaunā by the Sea and across the Sea. In: I. MALKIN (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*: 323–346. Washington, D.C.: HUP.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG, Heleen 2001b. The Problem of the Yauna. In: T. BAKIR (ed.), *Achaemenid Anatolia: Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period, Bandirma 15–18 August 1997*: 1–11. Leiden: Brill.
- SCHEIL, Vincent 1929. *Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse*. (Mémoires de la délégation archéologique en Iran 21) Paris: Leroux.
- SCHMIDT, Erich F. 1953. *Persepolis I: Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions*. (University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications 68) Chicago: UCP.

- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 1972. Die achaimenidische Satrapie Tyaiy Drayahya. *Historia* 21: 522–527.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 1991. *The Bisutun Inscriptions of Darius the Great*. (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1(1.1)) London: Humphries.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 1999. Zur Bedeutung von altpers. /dahyu-/. In: P. ANREITER & E. JEREM (eds), *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*: 443–452. Budapest: Akaprint.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 2000. *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis*. (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1(1.2)) London: Humphries.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 2009. *Die Altpersischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 2014. *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 2019. Überlegungen zu zwei neuen Altpersischen Inschriften (Phanagoria, Naqš-e Rostam). *Nartamongæ* 14(1/2): 34–49.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 2021. Die Sonderstellung der vier Inschriften DPd-g der Südmauer von Persepolis gegenüber den anderen Dareios-Texten. In: D. AGUT-LABORDÈRE, R. BOUCHARLAT, F. JOANNÈS, A. KUHRT & M.W. STOLPER (eds), *Achaemenet: Vingt ans après: Études offertes à Pierre Briant à l'occasion des vingt ans du Programme Achaemenet* (Collection Persika 21): 371–386. Leuven: Peeters.
- SCHWEIGER, Günter 1998. *Kritische Neuedition der achaimenidischen Keilinschriften*. Teimering: VWT.
- SHAVAREBI, Ehsan 2019. An Inscription of Darius I from Phanagoria (DFa): Preliminary Report of a Work in Progress. *Arta* 2019.005: 1–15.
- STEVE, Marie-Joseph 1974. *Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse* (Fouilles de 1952 à 1965). *Studia Iranica* 3: 7–28.
- SZEMERÉNYI, Oswald 1980. *Four Old Iranian Ethnic Names: Scythian – Skudra – Sogdian – Saka*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- TADMOR, Hayim 1999. World Dominion: The Expanding Horizon of the Assyrian Empire. In: L. MILANO, S. DE MARTINO, F.M. FALES & G.B. LANFRANCHI (eds), *Landscapes, Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East*: 55–62. Padova: Sargon.
- TUPLIN, Christopher J. 1991. Darius' Suez Canal and Persian Imperialism. In: H. SANCISI-WEERDENBURG & A.T. KUHRT (eds), *Achaemenid History VI. Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire*: 237–283. Leiden: Peeters.
- TUPLIN, Christopher J. 2010. Dareios' Scythian Expedition Revisited. In: J. NIELING & E. REHM (eds), *The Achaemenid Impact in the Black Sea: Communication of Powers*: 281–312. Aarhus: Centre for Black Sea Studies.
- TUPLIN, Christopher J. 2017. War and Peace in Achaemenid Imperial Ideology. In: F. MUCCIOLI & A. PIRAS (eds), *Looking East: Iranian History and Culture under Western Eyes* (Electrum 24): 31–54. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.
- VALLAT, François 1977. *Corpus des Inscriptions Royales en Elamite Achemenide*. PhD dissertation, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne.
- VON VOIGTLANDER, Elizabeth N. 1978. *The Bisutun Inscription of Darius the Great, Babylonian Version*. (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1(2)) London: Humphries.
- WASMUTH, Melanie 2017. *Ägypto-persische Herrscher- und Herrschaftspräsentation in der Achämenidenzeit*. (Oriens et Occidens 27) Stuttgart: Steiner.
- WEISSBACH, Franz H. 1911. *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*. (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 3) Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- WIESEHÖFER, Josef 1996. *Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD*. London: Taurus.
- WIESEHÖFER, Josef 2009/2011. Skudra, in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 12: 580–581.
- WU, Xin 2010. Enemies of Empire: A Historical Reconstruction of Political Conflicts between Central Asians and the Persian Empire. In: J. CURTIS & St J. SIMPSON (eds), *The World of Achaemenid Persia: Proceedings of a Conference at the British Museum 29th September – 1st October 2005*: 545–563. London: I.B. Tauris.
- WU, Xin 2014. 'O young man...make known of what kind you are': Warfare, History, and Elite Ideology of the Achaemenid Persian Empire. *Iranica Antiqua* 49: 209–298.
- ZOURNATZI, Antigoni 2018. Cyprus in the Achaemenid Rosters of Peoples and Lands. In: A. CANNAVÒ & L. THÉLY (eds), *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve d'histoire*: 189–200. Athens: École française d'Athènes.